

SCAAC Meeting Summary and Minutes

(School Curriculum, Assessment, and Accountability Council)

September 27, 2002
Auditorium, Ground Floor,
Capital Plaza Tower, Frankfort, Kentucky

Committee Members:

Margie T. Bradford

Dale Campbell

Kay Freeland

Suzanne Guyer

Varetta D. Hurt

Benny Lile, Chairman

Gary Mielcarek

Eleanor Mills

Henry Ormsby

Roger Pankratz

Robert Sexton

Linda Sheffield

H. M. Snodgrass

Nancy S. Sutton

Roxie R. Tempus

J. Maynard Thomas, Vice-
Chairman

One (1) Open Position

SCAAC Agenda

	Agenda Items	Presenters
	Call to Order	Benny Lile
1.	Roll Call	Roger Ervin
2.	Approval of May 31, 2002 Meeting Summary and Minutes	Benny Lile
3.	Examining Released CATS Data	Scott Trimble
4.	Testing Window	Scott Trimble
5.	NCLB Comparison Chart	Scott Trimble
6.	ACT Scores	Scott Trimble
7.	A2-A6 Schools Accountability	Scott Trimble
Adjournment		

Call to Order**Benny Lile**

Chairperson Benny Lile called the meeting to order at 9:16 a.m. EDT.

Chairperson Lile asked that the minutes reflect the receipt of the May 10, 2002 executive order from the Governor's Office. The executive order provides for appointment and reappointment of Council members K. Dale Campbell, D. Kay Freeland, Suzanne S. Guyer, Robert F. Sexton, Linda J. Sheffield, and Nancy S. Sutton.

1. Roll Call**Roger Ervin**

The membership roll was called with the following members present:

Margie Bradford
Dale Campbell
Kay Freeland
Suzanne Guyer

Varetta D. Hurt
Benny Lile
Henry Ormsby
Robert Sexton

Linda Sheffield
H. M. Snodgrass
J. Maynard Thomas

Presenters:

Scott Trimble, Office of Assessment and Accountability, Kentucky Department of Education

In Attendance:

Kentucky Department of Education: Roger Ervin
Kentucky Education Association (KEA): Sharon Felty Comer, Frances Steenbergen
Legislative Research Commission, Office of Education Accountability: Gerald Lunney

2. Approval of May 31, 2002 Meeting Summary and Minutes**Benny Lile**

SCAAC member comments:

The members reviewed the minutes and identified some grammatical and miss-spelled word corrections. Robert Sexton advised that a sentence on page 15 was missing "not" from the sentence. The corrected sentence is "There is the presumption that they will [not] be able to enforce ...

SCAAC Motion:

Kay Freeland made the motion to accept the May 31, 2002 Meeting Summary and Minutes with corrections. The motion was seconded by H. M. Snodgrass and passed unanimously.

SCAAC member comments:

The committee asked that Scott Trimble work with Building Security to allow council members access to the building at the ground level. Security requirements require members to enter the building at the main (lower level) entrance, which is difficult to reach from the parking structures and the street. This creates a hardship for members with a disability and all members who must brave the inclement weather to enter the building. Members were asked if they wanted to meet at another facility. The feeling was to first try to address the entrance issue prior to exploring other sites.

Benny Lile reminded members that the committee should take action on electing a new chairperson and vice-chair for the coming year. Discussion occurred between members on the process and whether to have the election at this meeting or the final meeting of the year.

SCAAC Motion:

Suzanne Guyer made the motion that the council retains the current chairperson (Benny Lile) and vice-chair (J. Maynard Thomas) for year 2003. The motion was seconded by H. M. Snodgrass and passed unanimously.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile advised members that action was required on a meeting calendar for the remainder of the 2002 and for 2003. The council decided on a tentative meeting date of November 25, 2002. This permits members to act on any items prior to the Kentucky State Board of Education meeting scheduled for December 3 & 4, 2002. The committee adopted a partial schedule for 2003 and plans to have meetings on January 31, 2003 and March 28, 2003.

Benny Lile asked committee members to revise today's agenda schedule and move item 4, Testing Window, next in the schedule to accommodate committee member schedules and provide the proper time to address the topic.

4. Testing Window	Scott Trimble
--------------------------	----------------------

KDE staff comments:

Members were provided a handout from Scott Trimble on future Commonwealth Accountability Testing System (CATS) Testing Windows. Scott Trimble advises that

House Bill 621 simply states that test results shall be back to schools in 150 days after the first day of the CATS test administration window. A number of Kentucky public school districts are on alternative schedules and have fewer instructional days prior to the test date than schools on a regular calendar. School districts, particularly in eastern Kentucky, also have to deal with closure for inclement weather (snow and icy roads). The proposal in the handout has been reviewed by a small group of Superintendents and District Assessment Coordinators. Each year the test administration window will start the last full instructional week in April. The sub-committee recommended that the testing window be four weeks in length. Within the four week window, each school district will choose a consecutive two week window starting on Monday for all its schools to administer the CATS test. The choice is for the entire district, thus this is a district decision and not a school by school decision. The clock as suggested in House Bill 621 is a 150 day reporting schedule and will start on the first Monday of the last two week window chosen by school districts. There are logistics issues. How do you establish a roster for accountability? There were several options that the Department could have suggested to the committee. The option that was suggested is where the student is enrolled in a school on the first day of testing is the school the student is accountable to. This is consistent with the way it is now except that school districts will choose one of the three testing windows. It is possible that some of the students may be lost in the system with students not being tested or partially tested. Scott provided different examples on how this might happen.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile wanted to know how one establishes a roster for accountability? The first day of testing is where student is accountable. How will students who reside in a district with a later testing window complete testing when they move during the testing window to a district with an early testing schedule? Benny advises his District Pupil Personnel (DPP) continues to say that when a student moves out of a district and until they register in another district they are absent; not withdrawn.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advises that staff in Assessment and Accountability keep hearing this and we have talked with the KDE staff in Finance. We have not been able to get a clear answer, however, our understanding is that if the student is officially withdrawn from a school, this action is not dependent on re-enrollment in another district.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile says that his DPP says that a student cannot be withdrawn until the student enters another school. School districts are interpreting this policy differently. The policy is hard to defend when you have a student from Michigan register on the first day of the testing window and the school becomes accountable for the students learning. But you can have a student that has been in a Kentucky district for the full academic year, and because they move on a certain day they are exempted from accountability. This doesn't pass the logic test. People bring this issue to me, and this happens quite often, there is

no way to defend this policy. The flexible testing window has a lot of good and accomplishes a lot of things districts need. Benny would hate to see the flexibility lost in a year because of a flood of issues. He would like to deal with them now.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble said that the intent is to try to reasonably hold some school in Kentucky accountable for every child in Kentucky. If the DPP says that student who withdraws from a school the day before the test date and doesn't register in another Kentucky school until after the first day of testing, is very difficult to argue that any school is accountable for that child, even though we want to be accountable for every child.

SCAAC member comments:

H. M. Snodgrass noted that this is not creating new problems as this currently occurs. Benny Lile feels that this will only magnify the problem. Having three accountability dates will increase the possibilities of a student not being included in accountability.

Maynard Thomas asks if there is data that supports that student test results are impacted by a lack of a few days of instruction. Has a comparison of schools been made of schools who are in the same situation with some having fewer days of instruction? Is this a lack of days of instruction or is something else occurring in the schools?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble said that analysis has not been performed on the data, but there is a perception on the part of school staff that this does impact student performance. Every day of instruction does count.

SCAAC member comments:

H. M. Snodgrass feels there is a broader issue than just number of days of instruction.

Maynard Thomas is concerned that the gaps in achievement are not just a number of days of instruction problem. The gaps seem equal across all schools, no matter the number of instructional days prior to the testing window. By having multiple accountability test dates, are we trying to fix something that is not broken? Aren't there other issues that are impacting student performance?

Kay Freeland reported that some eastern Kentucky school districts lose 20 instructional days in the year. Providing flexibility in the testing window helps compensate for the missed days. Allowing for a later test date will address issues with students who often think that once testing is complete, the school year is over.

Suzanne Guyer, talking from a teachers perspective, feels that most schools plan out the school year with the object of covering the core content prior to the testing window.

When a school has 20 fewer days of instruction prior to the test, students have not been taught parts of the core content and that can impact their performance on the test.

Margie Bradford advises that having alternate testing windows will help schools that are on an alternate calendar that traditionally have fewer days of instruction prior to the test.

Linda Sheffield doesn't believe that expanded testing will permit the fairness that some school districts are looking for. For example, Fort Thomas has no snow days and is not on alternate calendar. They will still test as late as possible.

Benny Lile has a concern about the floating student question will be a major issue during the window and is there a better way to deal with it than what has been identified.

Linda Sheffield comments that students who move may have had access to the questions not yet administered in the new school and he/she may share the questions.

Gerald Lunney is concerned about the student who is sick during the testing window. Committee members who are involved in testing advise that they will go to the home, to the hospital or where ever appropriate to complete testing. Some students are exempted from the test when students have signed doctor's exemption that meets Department requirements.

Dale Campbell asks why there is not a 150 day Kentucky public school enrollment rule as is done with the writing portfolio. Why is the student not exempted from accountability?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble says that when school calendars are looked at, the 150th day for school districts occurs across a wide window of six to eight weeks. This is caused by scheduling of different days off. With the flexible testing schedule we are effectively expanding the window to accommodate two to four weeks of the 150th day school calendar. The National Technical Advisory Panel of Assessment and Accountability (NTAPAA) is concerned about the expanded window as it provides more exposure for the test.

SCAAC member comments:

Varetta D. Hurt agrees with the others and feels that we cannot pre-plan for all situations. We can only do the best we can. Psychologically teachers feel they need every day of instruction they can have. Students feel that once the test is completed, school is then out.

Maynard Thomas and Linda Sheffield asked about the impact on the reporting schedule with a later test date. Benny advised that the impact is the reporting date for school results will happen approximately two weeks later; from September 15th to approximately October 1. Linda asked about the schedule impact when the requirements of the No Child Left Behind Act of 2001 (NCLB) are factored in.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble responded that this doesn't change the requirements of NCLB. This will make it more difficult to meet the NCLB timelines. Not doing this doesn't help the problem either. To meet the requirements of NCLB, we will need to test much earlier, possibly conflicting with events such as the Kentucky High School Basketball tournament.

OEA staff comments:

Gerald Lunney raised issues on testing security when you have the County Public Schools testing on one window and the Independents in the county on another.

SCAAC member comments:

H. M. Snodgrass and Benny Lile pointed out that within a district schools can vary the dates and times that the content areas are administered. One school may choose to start testing on Monday and some may start on Wednesday. The opportunities are there if they want to do inappropriate practices.

Linda Sheffield is concerned about the conflict of the CATS test with Advanced Placement tests.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advises that districts will have to consider the needs of their high schools when setting the test window date. This could be a problem and may create tensions between high schools and the elementary and middle schools in the district.

OEA staff comments:

Gerald Lunney is concerned about the impact of Kentucky Derby events on Jefferson County Public Schools (JCPS).

SCAAC member comments:

H. M. Snodgrass advises that JCPS was present at the meeting and they could accommodate the Kentucky Derby events. They are supportive of the proposal.

SCAAC Motion:

Margie Bradford made the motion to adopt the proposal as presented. The motion was seconded by Kay Freeland.

Benny Lile asked that the Kentucky Department of Education continue to look at the issue of the accountability roster and when students are moving from one district to another.

The committee voted on a motion to support the change in testing window policy, and the motion passed unanimously.

SCAAC member comments:

Maynard Thomas feels that if the flexible testing window is implemented, that there should be some improved changes in student achievement.

The committee had a 10 minute break and reconvened at 10:17 a.m.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile reconvened the meeting and asked committee members to hear about the status of the Testing contract.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble provided an update on the Assessment contract. The contract, a result of House Bill 53, was signed in 1998 and was for 4 years with an option for one 4 year renewal period. The contract is a fixed price contract with CTB McGraw Hill (CTB). When negotiations began on the four year renewal, the initial price came back unacceptably high. The second price came down but still was not acceptable. The final price is 6 million dollars lower over the four years than the initial renewal price. The original contract had WestEd and Data Recognition Corporation (DRC) as CTB subcontractors. CTB determined that they could provide the lower cost if they handled the work previously performed by DRC. DRC was responsible for Kentucky Core Content Test printing, hand scoring, and printing/distribution of the score reports. From the Kentucky Department of Education's standpoint, both from a legal and financial perspective, the subcontract issue is between CTB and DRC. Department staff believe CTB will provide equal service to schools and districts.

The new agreement provides advantages to the Commonwealth. Student open responses will now be handled in an imaged environment instead of the traditional role of the open response scorer handling paper. The student response booklets will be immediately scanned and an electronic image of the student's open responses will be captured. The electronic image can then be distributed to multiple scorers instead of one scorer which permits processing efficiencies.

This will provide time savings for scoring. A second advantage is that imaging will permit distribution of scoring where sites can be set up in Kentucky and Kentucky teachers can be scorers. This is a vehicle for teacher professional development. When the teachers involved with the scoring internalize what students are doing, they focus instruction more efficiently.

One scenario for Spring 2003 is to setup four secure sites in Kentucky to score field test items and to build capacity while not introducing risk. The requirements to accomplish scoring are a PC Workstation with secure high speed connections to the Internet. CTB is currently doing this with the state of Missouri. In future years more regional sites will be setup and Kentucky teachers will begin to score regular test items.

Other benefits are that rater reliability will increase. The number of test questions read by a second scorer will increase from 2% to 10%.

In summary the extension of the contract will deliver the same scoring service and the same or higher quality of service.

SCAAC member comments:

Linda Sheffield asked about security issues with the test with Kentucky teachers seeing the test items and how students respond to the open response questions.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that Kentucky teachers currently write, edit and select test items. Kentucky teachers are an honorable group of people. When a Kentucky teacher signs a

non-disclosure form that says that they understand the administrative code, they honor test item security. There are very few exceptions. There have only been one or two allegations of test item security issues.

SCAAC member comments:

SCAAC members who work in schools and districts confirmed that teachers do not breach test security.

Dale Campbell was interested in knowing whether there is a change in scoring accuracy when documents are imaged and scored online instead of traditional paper scoring?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble says that the studies to date of scoring imaged documents do not change the expected distribution of score points.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile noted that the student response may be enhanced when the document is imaged. High quality equipment actually can improve the image over traditional paper.

Kay Freeland wanted to know when the contract will be officially renewed.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble says that the contract was signed last week, either Thursday or Friday. From the Department's perspective, we have a valid signed contract.

3. Examining Released CATS Data
--

Scott Trimble

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble asked members to review the pressing briefing packet that was provided to members at the beginning of the meeting. Scott summarized the findings:

- 553 elementary, middle and high schools are meeting or exceeding their growth requirements.
- Six schools have attained their 2014 goal of reaching an index of 100.
- Fewer middle schools and even fewer high schools are meeting goal which is a concern. Only 38% of high schools are meeting goal.
- 138 schools are in the progressing zone.
- 401 additional schools would have been in the progressing and meets goal classifications had they met the novice reduction and dropout requirements. A high percentage of the high schools fell into this category because they did not meet dropout requirements. The Kentucky Board of Education has expressed concern about this.

- 90 schools fell below the assistance line. The schools are then rank ordered on their absolute growth index for 2001-2002. The lowest one-third are subject to a scholastic audit, and will have a Highly Skilled Educator assigned to the school.

These numbers can change because schools have 14 days after public release of scores to notify the Department of data corrections and 45 days to appeal their performance judgment.

SCAAC member comments:

Dale Campbell is interested in high schools that are below the assistance point. Are studies planned with the data available including numbers of special education students, percent of at risk students housed at those schools?

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advises that the data are out there. It isn't accumulated or summarized as described but it is very possible for people to accomplish it. If this committee wishes the Department to provide summarized data we will be glad to perform the calculations and bring it back to you.

SCAAC member comments:

Dale Campbell and Benny Lile discuss the availability of student level data that is provided to school districts on CD and information available on the WEB.

Maynard Thomas wants to clarify the definition of at risk students. Dale's descriptor is free and reduced lunch participants.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advises that other groups will also include students with disabilities as an at risk group. Scott then described a data tool developed by Office of Assessment and Accountability staff to assist districts and schools in performing analysis of their student level data. Districts have been provided student level data for their students and can perform the analysis by looking at different subgroups.

SCAAC member comments:

Maynard Thomas thanks Scott Trimble and KDE for separating proficient and distinguished on KPR disaggregated data reports.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble discussed School Recognition Points and Pace-setter schools with the committee. The recognition points on the accountability scale are 55, 66, 77, 88, and 100. When a school passes a recognition point for the first time, and they are eligible for rewards, the school receives an additional rewards share. One school passed three recognition points. Pacesetter schools are schools that score above the fourth recognition point (88) and meet all dropout and novice reduction requirements. These

schools can earn a share of rewards when they have not received other reward shares from being a meets goal or progressing school.

In summary the pleasing number is that 553 schools are meeting goal and only 90 are in the assistance category. The major concern is the number of schools that are not meeting their dropout and novice reduction requirements. Department staff has spent a lot of time looking at the 401 schools prior to the release of the results and is continuing to look at why schools are not meeting these two requirements. This affects the performance of subpopulations. The disaggregated data is available on the WEB.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile is concerned about the schools in rewards with accountability indexes in the fifties and sixties. The trend data shows that the assistance numbers will go up. We may be looking at 400 schools in assistance because of novice reduction requirements and the need for schools to increase their scores to attain an growth accountability index of 100.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble concurs that if schools do not address the high number of novice students, we could have many more schools in assistance by 2004. A large number of schools not meeting their 2002 novice reduction requirements will be offered a scholastic review and assistance from the regional service teams once scholastic audits are completed.

SCAAC member comments:

Kay Freeland points out that there is a State and National problem with the number of students that dropout of school between the 9th grade and 12th grade. She cites Kentucky student enrollment rates by grade level from the media briefing packet.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble reminded members that the enrollment rates by grade level are also influenced by retention rates. For example, students at grade 9 have a much higher retention rate than any other high school grade level. The dropout problem is still there, but the retention rate complicates the dropout issue.

SCAAC member comments:

Dale Campbell in his review of high schools has found that high performing schools lose students while low performing schools retain students. There is an inverse proportion of high performing schools and number of students dropping out.

The committee had a lunch break starting at 11:25 a.m. The committee reconvened at 12:00 noon.

7. A2-A6 Schools Accountability

Scott Trimble

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile asked the committee to take action on A2-A6 Schools Accountability at this time. It is the intent of the Kentucky State Board to deal with this issue at their December 2002 meeting. Because the Board has dealt with this at other meetings it is likely that they will provide KDE with direction they should take including revision of regulations.

Benny Lile advises that this committee has felt that schools are accepting of the accountability for A2-A6 students when the school has control over the student. The issue of school accountability arises when students travel around the commonwealth, are wards of the court, or are under the control of the juvenile justice system. Schools feel they should not be accountable for these students since they have no direct control over the instruction of these students.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble referred members to the study conducted by Jefferson County schools involving their students housed in non-A1 schools. *{Study included in member's packet of materials}*

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile indicates his perception that the State Board has some members that are very concerned about this issue. There are members sensitive to the issue of when schools are held accountable for students. There are other members who feel that all students should be accountable to an A1 school; no students are excluded from accountability. Current policy is that students who are outside of the district attending a non-A1 facility for multiple years are still accountable back to the A1 school that the parents/legal guardians reside in. A student can leave the district at the elementary level and the middle and high schools within the district will continue to be held accountable for the student. People in the field cannot accept the logic of this. Benny is in full support of someone being accountable for the child, however should it be the school that has never seen the child?

H. M. Snodgrass advises that one of the options discussed is that if the state is responsible for these children, then aggregate the results to the state and they are responsible. However, until there is a legitimate solution we have to track the students back to the A1 school.

Benny Lile reinforces the fact that the A1 school is taking the hit for these children. This is a paper solution as the A1 school has no impact on the instruction of these students. The A1 school is taking a hit for convenience.

Kay Freeland advises that Rowan Co has many of these group homes. Not one of the students have Rowan Co parents/legal guardians. Many have been placed there by the court system. Many are level 4 and level 5 juvenile offenders. These are children that have had a rough life. This is still unfair to districts who have a number of group homes and facilities. Rowan Co has had to absorb the scores for many of these students.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble reviews the original rationale for this policy. This solution seemed most appropriate at the time. There were a number of problems but the feeling was that an A1 school needed to be accountable for each student. There was a strong feeling that the reform act had built a basis for doing this through the Family Resource Centers and other social supports. It was felt that the host area would become unstable if students were not held accountable back to the A1 school. The founders of the reform act did not want encourage the inappropriate placement of students in these facilities.

Scott reminded members that students at the Kentucky School for the Blind and the Kentucky School for the Deaf are tracked back to A1 schools.

SCAAC member comments:

H. M. Snodgrass asks with the state of technology how feasible is it to have two categories, those placed by A1 schools and those placed by other agencies and aggregate the data that way.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advises that with the STI system we ought to be able to accomplish this within a couple of years. The thought was that this population would be reduced in number. In fact, this population has gone up about 15% over the past four years.

Scott is looking to this group on what the recommendation should be. The Department would like to know if there is a consensus and what should be brought forward to the Kentucky State Board of Education.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile feels that if a A5-A6 Accountability grouping were created and as it became public knowledge we would better serve the academic needs of these students.

H. M. Snodgrass shares that there are certain criteria staff in these settings must meet in terms of counseling time. There also is another set of expectations from the Department of Juvenile Justice and other agencies that there is other criteria that must be met with these students. H. M. Snodgrass supports the concept of grouping A5-A6 schools for accountability.

Robert Sexton noted that for NCLB purposes these students could be accountable to an A1 school.

H. M. Snodgrass advised that they can be put in a state pool.

KDE staff comments:

After discussion turned to draft Federal Annual Yearly Progress regulations, Scott Trimble emphasized that this is a draft regulation and there is conflicting issues with a student being in school for a full year.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile feels that option 2B in the paper is the A1 School accountability where the A1 school is accountable for students they placed in A2-A6 schools. Students placed by the court system and other agencies would be attributable to the district or region or state. Benny wants to know if we can assign accountability to the Division of Juvenile Justice?

H. M. Snodgrass feels that there needs to be some discussion with them because of the other requirements. He is nervous about assigning these students to the district. In high consequence accountability it seems it is not appropriate to assign the students to a district when the facility serves multiple districts.

OEA staff comments:

Gerald Lunney believes the rationale is that the A-1 school has responsibility and that the A1 school needs to be communicating with the A2-A6 school to make sure something is happening with the instructional needs of the student. His perception is that the real problem are the surprises. If you send a student there you expect the scores to come back to you. Gerald wonders as part of the court assignment of the student an A2-A6 facility should include resolution of the A1 school for accountability purposes.

SCAAC member comments:

Kay Freeland points that some students have been in treatment centers and have not been in an A1 school for four or five years.

Maynard Thomas wants to know if the standards at the alternative schools are the same as at the A1 schools as far as graduation requirements are concerned. Thinking about the student, do those students have any confidence of getting back into mainstream education? Are the alternative schools preparing the student to be successful or are they just writing them off?

Benny Lile advises in his district students do return to traditional schools and the graduation requirements are the same.

Maynard Thomas is familiar with a district where students dropout of school, then return to an alternative school. The graduation requirements are less so they are able to graduate earlier.

Dale Campbell advises that this is more an alternative of time. This would not be the treatment facility setting but students entering an alternative learning center.

Benny Lile advises that this is complicated by the fact that students in a group home may be viewed as a program where the group home is receiving services from the A1 school and is not considered a A5-A6 school. The students are not under the control of the district even though the students by definition are accountable to the A1 school in the district. Juvenile justice and the court system can move these students with no notification or involvement of the district.

Maynard Thomas is wondering if a category needs to be added to identify this population of students.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble provided an expanded definition of A5 and A6 schools. He also discussed Jefferson County High School (JCHS), one of the A5 alternative schools in Jefferson County. Students who come to this school have a need to have classes on a different schedule than at a traditional high school. The graduation requirements are the same or similar. Students attend for 6 weeks may dropout for another 6 weeks and return. Jefferson County also has A5 schools for students with behavioral problems. Students can choose to go to JCHS but districts from outside Jefferson Co do not assign students to the school.

SCAAC member comments:

Linda Sheffield is interested in knowing how foster children are handled.

Benny Lile advises that for accountability foster children, where possible, are tracked back to the A1 school from where they originally came from. The same issues apply to these students as students who are housed in treatment facilities. Benny pointed out a situation where it appears that students that perform well on the test are retained by the school while others are tracked back to the original A1 school. There is much interpretation of rules and significant effort and time spent by school and district staff tracking students back.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble asked for advice from the committee. Does the committee want to leave the policy as is? Some are saying the policy is appropriate when the A1 school assigns the student to a non-A1 setting and has control over the student. There is a sensitivity that for students not under the direct control of a district, the Department should look at alternative models of accountability. The committee is not saying that there should be shared accountability between a state agency and A1 schools.

OEA staff comments:

Gerald Lunney is concerned about lumping students together who are falling through the cracks into one school. The committee wants these students to receive the same level of instruction as found in traditional schools. By combining these students into one school we will not know how the individual facilities are performing. We will not be able to identify what good programs are and where the poor programs exist.

SCAAC member comments:

Maynard Thomas points out that the ultimate goal is that all students reach proficiency whether they are attending an A1 school or an A2-A6 school. If local schools do not have control over students who are placed by the law or for treatment, they are not in position to apply pressure to the schools to be accountable for providing instruction to those students. An A1 school can only influence the teaching of the student when the A1 school places the student at the A2-A6 school.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble asked if we could consider some criteria that if the Kentucky State Board defines a situation where an A1 school should or could have control over the student's education in A2-A6 setting, then the A1 school should be accountable.

SCAAC member comments:

Kay Freeland is concerned that her A1 school by providing instruction to the group homes will accept the student's accountability results. This would result in her district taking in 80 to 100 student scores for students whose legal residence is not her district. This is unfair to her district.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble revised the criteria so that if the Kentucky State Board defines a situation where an A1 school recommends or assigns the student to an A2-A6 school and the A1 school has control over the student's education in A2-A6 setting, then the A1 school should be accountable. A solution would need to be worked out for students attending A2-A6 schools who not meet the criteria. This could include accountability at the state or some other agency within state government or could be regional. The feeling is that it would not be a district.

SCAAC Motion:

H.M. Snodgrass moves that we adopt this position in principal. Obviously the details will have to be worked out. The motion is seconded by Maynard Thomas. Benny Lile reiterates for the committee that when schools are directly responsible for the placement of the students in a non-A1 setting, the A1 school should be accountable for that student. All other settings should be considered under another form of accountability. The motion was voted on and passed unanimously.

3. Examining Released CATS Data *(Continued)*

Scott Trimble

Benny Lile introduced the next topic: the Kentucky Performance Report or KPR.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised the members that a copy the state KPR was now in their packet of materials. Scott walked the committee through a review of the KPR providing background information and noting the content found on each page of report.

{The minutes only reflect discussion that occurred between committee members and questions asked of KDE staff.}

SCAAC member comments:

Linda Sheffield wanted to know if the student responses to the questionnaire data have been compared to the performance of the school.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that Office of Assessment and Accountability staff have not performed this analysis. However, research files are available on the WEB that will permit a researcher to accomplish this. Dale Campbell earlier had had a data question as he is interested in high schools that are below the assistance point. He wanted to know if studies are planned with the data available including numbers of special education students, percent of at risk students housed at these schools. Some of this can be accomplished with the files on the WEB. The questions are of interest to us as it may prove useful to add some of the analysis to the KPR.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile and Linda Sheffield commended KDE for the amount of information that is provided to districts and schools. Linda does not see this level of information shared in any other state program. Benny shared his experience at a national meeting he attended with 17 other states present. The facilitator, after looking at what Kentucky schools receive, said that the other 16 would love to just get some of the information.

Maynard Thomas is very happy to receive regional data.

Dale Campbell asked if there were one or two items on the KPR that really jump out this time.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble says that the KPR shows that schools are making reasonable and consistent progress. The question is: "Are we making progress fast enough?" That cannot be answered yet. We need to replicate the GAP study as was done with the KIRIS data to see if the gaps are remaining the same, getting better, or not improving.

SCAAC member comments:

Maynard Thomas asked that all members receive the data found on the WEB on a CD.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble will arrange for each committee member to receive the CD. The CD will contain pdf files, file layouts for the data files, and the data files in dbf format.

SCAAC member comments:

Suzanne Guyer thanked the Department for making information available and that they were making it easier to understand. The question is what is allowing the top performing schools to be able to be top performing schools. That is where we need to go. The student questionnaire should help in identifying what is working.

5. NCLB Comparison Chart

Scott Trimble

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble provided a walk through of the NCLB comparison chart starting with page 1. The chart shows what the NCLB language says, what Kentucky is currently doing and what Kentucky may propose. The chart deals with Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP). The plan has to be delivered to the U.S. Department of Education by January 31, 2003. The Kentucky Board of Education plans to discuss at the October Board meeting, a special Board meeting in November, and possibly at meetings in December and a special meeting in January. Washington will study our proposal for two to three months and by May 1st will tell us that we are ok or what we need to change.

The NCLB requirements require us to test students in Reading and Mathematics at grades 3 through 8 by Spring 2006. The proposal before the Board calls for a norm referenced multiple choice test augmented with a couple of KCCT type open response questions. We will continue the KCCT assessment in reading at grades 4 and 7 and Mathematics at grades 5 and 8. The Reading test will be augmented at grades 3, 5, 6, and 8 and the Mathematics test at grades 3, 4, 6, and 7. NCLB requires that you measure the breadth and the content of a state's curriculum. At this time no norm reference test measures the breadth of our core content. The two national norm reference assessments reviewed in 1998 only measure about 30% to 40% of our core content. We will interpolate performance at the KCCT grades to provide Novice, Apprentice, Proficient and Distinguished performance levels at the augmented grades. We have been asked to see if we can get the test in place for Spring 2005.

SCAAC member comments:

Linda Sheffield asked how longitudinal scores in reading and mathematics can follow the student.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advised that you can pull the longitudinal scores from this model. We are not planning to conduct a longitudinal assessment in Spring 2003.

SCAAC member comments:

H. M. Snodgrass reminds the group that he had expressed concerns about the direction the Department was moving with the longitudinal assessment some months ago. Glad we are going in a different direction. The second recommendation is that the Department not get carried away in enhancements to the tests at the augmented grades. The third item in regards to the Federal accountability component, we should not let up on the State accountability component but for identification of Adequate Yearly Progress limit those decisions to the reading and mathematics improvement.

Kay Freeland points out that we have an accountability system in place and we will punish ourselves with our high standards in getting federal money. Kay asked for information on how many Kentucky schools will meet the AYP requirements.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advises that about 60 schools might meet AYP. This is using our seven content areas. Depending who you are, things are being interpreted differently. If we to just look at reading and mathematics, approximately 400 schools would be successful.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton is under the belief that the Federal Government will not withhold funds even though we do not want to operate that way.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble reported that the Kentucky State Board of Education, has stated that Kentucky will not forgo federal money.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton understands that students in schools not meeting AYP will be able to transfer every year.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble says that Kentucky is trying to change that to every other year to correspond to our biennial reporting of accountability results. Kentucky is trying to define schools as lack of AYP as our level three assistance schools. This is what we are currently operating under and we are trying to have the U.S. Department of Education agree to this for NCLB. The district defines where the students will be transferred to. There may be 28 schools that will be required to offer the transfer option as a result of the September reporting. The question may be different when you get out to year six. The 28 schools are Title 1 schools. Two of the Assistance Level 3 schools are not Title

1 schools so they are not bound by NCLB requirements. At this time it is not clear what KDE will do but it appears that we will not ask the two schools to offer school choice.

Providers of Supplemental Services are going to be determined through a RFP process.

Extended School Services (ESS) can not be provided by the school when they are a Level 3 school. The services might be provided by the district, a neighboring district, or possibly a successful school within the district.

The Department may have to introduce a regulation for a district accountability system that parallels the school accountability system. This is not a small issue for districts. Based on analysis run by Ohio on their schools, we may find that more districts are not meeting AYP for a number of reasons than schools.

There are different approaches to adequate yearly progress measures. If you read the NCLB statute and listen to U.S. Department of Education staff you will be told that there is a single growth line for reading and another single growth line for mathematics and possibly in the other five content areas for the whole state. You would compare every school in the state to those growth lines. There will be growth lines for elementary, middle and high schools. Schools must be above the growth point on the line. Also schools with ethnic populations have to be above the line. The same applies to students with disabilities, low SES, and LEP to meet AYP. So the total population and sub-populations in reading must be above the line and same for mathematics to be AYP successful.

We are planning to propose our system which will be based on our system of percent of students reaching proficient.

At this time no states have lowered their standards. Some states are talking about it.

SCAAC member comments:

Benny Lile comments that there are some districts that have lowered their grading standards so students can obtain more KEES money.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble was unaware of any attempt to lower Kentucky standards.

OEA staff comments:

Gerald Lunney asked if NAEP is going to counteract lowering of state standards.

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble advises no since NAEP standards are similar to our standards. He has seen activity for NAEP to cause states with low standards to raise their standards.

Our system is a biennial model. Our model builds in larger number of students, thus making it a more stable, more dependable school classification system. The U.S. Office of Education is going to argue that we need an annual accountability decision and we can average three years of data. This has major shortfalls as certain years can hold you back. We need to press hard for our biennial system.

Baseline data is set in the 2002 school year.

The Kentucky system assigns more value to each of the performance classifications for getting schools to proficiency. NCLB requires that 100% of the students need to get to proficiency. This translates to pass/fail and goes against everything we have learned over the past 10 years.

The Kentucky model requires that you be accountable for every student in your school. NCLB says that you have to be accountable for 95% of something. NCLB wants 95% of the total population and each sub-population in reading and mathematics. Not sure if they are talking about 95% of all students or 95% of accountable students.

You have to be accountable for all your students in your school for a full academic year. An interesting question is what is a full academic year. Is it from the first day when school starts to the last day of school? So if we test April 21, 2003 and the student comes the school on the first day when school starts, have you been in the school for a full academic year? Some feel we are talking about a calendar year. Some will argue that until you have been in the school from the first day when school starts to the last day when school ends, you have not been in the school for a full academic year.

When it comes to our LEP population, we are holding ourselves to a little higher standard. We can think about a district accountability system where the LEP student is accountable to the district if we had a parallel accountability system for the district.

We will probably need to implement a district accountability system. Some additional reasons are that in small districts, schools will never be accountable for sub-populations. We may need to hold districts accountable for appropriate instruction for the sub-populations unless we aggregate the data to the district level. This is what Ohio found out when they analyzed their school data.

We have an issue and not a solution on having to meet NCLB reporting deadlines. We have a letter from Secretary Paige saying that is ok for us to be late in getting our data back this year but not to be late in the future. The NCLB language says that you must have the data back in schools so they can notify parents of their rights to school choice and supplemental services, schools must have time to review their performance judgments, and schools have 30 days to contest and resolve appeals. Our current appeals process takes from six to eight months. The results have to be back to the schools prior to the start of school and in time for the schools to complete the notification

and appeals of performance judgments. At this time, we do not know what to do about this.

Alternate Portfolio is a holistic portfolio draws from a subset of our academic expectations and yields one score. It represents about 0.7 percent of our students. There are places in the regulation that suggest that it has to yield both a reading and mathematics score. The draft regulation says that we could only count 0.5 percent of our population we could score against our Alternate Portfolio standards. Everything over that we need to score against the regular standard. Scott has seen more comment on this part of the draft regulation than any other part as people feel this is unreasonable.

Our core content is derived from the program of studies which is grade specific.

If a LEP student is in the school a full academic year prior to the point of assessment, then the student must be tested and the school is accountable for the child. If you are in an English speaking school for two academic years prior to the point of assessment, then you have to test the student. If you have been in the district for a full academic year prior to the point of assessment, then you have to test the child. The point of contention is what is a full academic year. KDE defined it as from the first day that school starts to last day of school. We believe that the people who developed this language thought of a full calendar year, but they didn't write it that way. People in Washington may want to say that if the student was in your school on April 21, 2002 and you test on April 21, 2003, the student has been in your school for a full academic year. We may have to test students but the school may not be held accountable.

Scott covered the two approved tests for assessment of English proficiency. It begins this year.

There apparently are English proficiency standards that Kentucky and many other states have yet to adopt. We will need to figure out what standards we want to measure.

6. ACT Scores

Scott Trimble

KDE staff comments:

Scott Trimble asked members to destroy the ACT results previously received in an e-mail as there were some errors in the attachment that came with the e-mail. Please use the report included in your folder.

ACT scores are pretty flat. We wished that they had not gone down by .1. The results for the nation went down .2.

NTAPAA is recommending that we do some content studies. We need to understand what it is that this test is asking us to teach and whether or not that is different than what our core content is asking us to teach.

We are not aware of other states who have attempted to align their core content with the ACT test.

SCAAC member comments:

Linda Sheffield points out that the state core content is more extensive than ACT.

Robert Sexton points out that 75% of our students are novice and apprentice on mathematics. On the ACT, 50% are.

Benny Lile is concerned about the reliability of data when a student self codes. There is a mis-understanding on how to code "core".

Robert Sexton points out that English has fallen by far more than anything else. English has fallen by .5 from 19.9 to 19.4. This is happening all over.

Dale Campbell advises that the number of students taking the ACT has increased significantly in Kentucky because of KEES money.

Robert Sexton wants to know if the national average in English has fallen at the same level. He would be surprised if it has.

OEA staff comments:

Gerald Lunney notes that ACT is a timed test where students taking the KCCT are allowed as much time as needed. There is a different strategy in taking a timed test than when you have all the time you need.

SCAAC member comments:

Robert Sexton recommends that the State Board authorize an alignment study to help determine what is going on.

Robert Sexton asked Skip Keifer about the comparison of state tests and the ACT and he responded that nothing can be accomplished by doing it. The tests have different purposes and have different requirements. The SAT is much more of an intelligence test.

ADJOURNMENT

SCAAC Motion:

Dale Campbell introduced a motion for meeting adjournment. Kay Freeland seconded the motion. The Committee voted at 3:00 p.m. to adjourn and the motion passed unanimously.